

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 10, 17 and 18; claims 19-20 have been added. Support for the added claims may be found in the Specification in the Summary and in the Detailed Description on pages 8-10. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner Objections – Specification

The specification was objected to because of several informalities. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the specification. In response, the Applicant has modified the specification as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's consideration of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The Applicant respectfully submits that the term “transcoding” objected to in claim 9, line 2, “...generates a request for transcoding” is a term of art and is used appropriately. The term “transcoding” refers to the act of modifying a stream of data so the data can be carried by a different type of network. The use of transcoding is found throughout the Specification and an illustration of transcoding can be found on page 5, lines 8-11 - “For example, text information can be transcoded into audio information. Another type of format conversion comprises transcoding visual information from one visual format to another visual format.” The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of this claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-5 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeLorme (US 6,321,158). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims.

The present invention discloses a method and system for providing real-time information, "guiding information," to a user that includes audible and visual information. "Guiding information" includes real-time data from static data sources such as sensors (page 9, lines 11-22), stored data (page 9, lines 2-9) and transmitted data (page 8, lines 7-12). Data from a plurality of information sources is used in developing a specification of a message that is then conveyed to the user via a visual or auditory medium, depending on the situation of the user. The present invention discloses the use of "static information objects" to provide real-time information in addition to the position of a user/vehicle. For instance, as disclosed on page 9, lines 2-7: "[S]tatic data can e.g. identify sensors at the vehicle for various measurements, addresses to remote locations for download of specified information, and events that should occur when a specified parameter value reaches a specified limit value. For example, if the fuel level decreases below a preset value, guiding information may appear for locating a fuel station...". The plurality of information sources include the sensors that provide real time data, stored data providing fixed site information such as roads, hotels, restaurants, etc., and internet and broadcast channels that provide current information such as traffic and weather.

The DeLorme reference discloses an integrated routing/mapping information system where a user plans a trip using a first computer and downloads information about the trip into a second, mobile computer (e.g., PDA). The PDA has a display or speaker for presenting routing information (visually or verbally). The second computer is coupled to a GPS system in order to co-ordinate route information from the first computer with a current location of the user.

The Applicant respectfully submits that all the elements of the Applicant's independent claims, both prior to and after amendment, are not found in the DeLorme reference. The rejection discussed: the desktop application being used for maps,

destinations, etc.; the GPS receiver used in conjunction with the PDA for a user's current heading, etc. and the option that the driver can embellish a route or travel plan with multimedia such as graphic images, videos, etc.

The Detailed Action does not describe the limitations of DeLorme that correspond to and anticipate the limitations of the Applicant's independent claim. The rejection language is structured as narrative and the Applicant is not really sure which of DeLorme's specific limitations actually anticipate which Applicant's limitations. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the DeLorme reference lacks, at least, the limitation of creating "the specification of a message comprising an information object" (prior to and after amendment).

With regard to the amended claim 1, DeLorme lacks the limitations means for generating/creating a specification of a message ... and "... wherein said selection (of media) is based on availability of the preferred medium and a priority associated with the output of information". The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the respective dependent claim. Claim 10 is analogous to claim 1 and contains similar limitations. This being the case the Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 and dependent claim 11.

Claims 3-5 and 12-14 contain the same limitations of claims 1 and 10 and for this reason at least, the Applicant respectfully submits that the DeLorme reference does not anticipate claims 3-5 and 12-14. Though claims 7 and 17 are not noted in the summary of paragraph 2 as being anticipated by the DeLorme reference, these claims were included in the discussion. As stated above, the Applicant respectfully submits that these claims 3-5, 7, 12-14 and 17 are not anticipated by DeLorme for at least the reasons cited above with respect to claims 1 and 10. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 6, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLorme (US 6,321,158) in view of Buckham, et al. (US 6,662,016). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Buckham reference is cited for providing graphical location information to modify DeLorme in order to provide on-board coordination. However, Buckham fails to provide the limitation of a specification of a message using the information sources as recited above.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. One of those basic criteria is that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (MPEP 2143). In that regard, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the Examiner's two references still fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the presently pending independent claims.

Claims 6, 15 and 16 depend from amended claims 1 and 10 respectively and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the allowance of claims 6, 15 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLorme (US 6,321,158) in view of Ohmura, et al. (US 6,208,932). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.


The Ohmura reference is cited for providing priority classified information to modify DeLorme in order to provide on-board coordination. However, Ohmura fails to provide the limitation of a specification of a message using the information sources as recited above. As noted above, the missing claim limitations cause the combination of the two references to fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 8-9 and 18 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,


By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: August 2, 2007

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com